



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,910	07/24/2001	Tokuo Nakatani	2001_1041	4644
513	7590 01/25/2006		EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W.			BOCCIO, VINCENT F	
SUITE 800	321 K. W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			2616	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/910,910 NAKATANI ET AL.		L.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Vincent F. Boccio	2616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI , cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to th	e merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	-	received in this Nationa	l Stage			
application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list		roccived				
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies hot	receiveu.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/21/05.</li> </ul>		s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			
- · · · ·	• — —					

Application/Control Number: 09/910,910 Page 2

Art Unit: 2616

### DETAILED ACTION

The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2616.

#### Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a 1. judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims [1-2 apparatus], [3-4 method], [5-6 computer readable], [7-8 rewritable optical disc], [9-10, optical disc recording apparatus], are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims [1, 3 apparatus], [4, 6 method], [7, 9 computer readable], [10, 12, optical disc recording apparatus] of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,704. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because.

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding claims 1-10, against patented claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, recite all as recited between, but, there exist a difference in scope between the claims such as:

The formula as recited in application claims uses a [=] operator, but, the patented claims use [= & >], therefore, the patented claims are deemed narrower for further reciting the > operator.

Further it is further noted that the patented claims provide for writable, but, the patented claims fail to recite re-writable.

The examiner takes official notice that mediums can be writable which reads on a WORM, but, rewritable reads on a RAM or RW type disks, well known in the art, therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time of the invention to further recite rewritable in claim 10, for the optical disk type as being an obvious disk type, as is well known to those skilled in the art.

Allowance of claims 1-10 of the instant application would result in a time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim(s), therefore, obviousness type double patenting is deemed proper.

## Contact Fax Information

Any response to this action should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, for communication as intended for entry, this Central Fax Number as of 7/15/05

## Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner of record, Monday-Tuesday & Thursday-Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Vincent F. Boccio (571) 272-7373.

Primary Examiner, Boccio, Vincent 1/21/06

